

### **REMARKS**

Claims 1-12, 16-17 and 19-24 and 26-39 are pending in the present application. By this reply, claims 13-15, 18 and 25 have been cancelled and new claims 30-39 have been added. No new matter is involved with the claim amendments.

#### **Claim Amendments & New Claims**

Claim 12 has been amended to incorporate the subject matter of claim 13.

In claims 16 and 23, "additional contents data source" has been changed to --optical disc-- and the feature "the additional contents data include font data" has been added; see, e.g., previous claims 17-18 and 24-25 and Figs. 3 and 4 for support.

Claims 17 and 24 have been amended to recite that the optical disc is a DVD; see, e.g., Figs. 2-4 for support.

In claims 22 and 29, "font data" has been changed to --said font data-- to provide proper antecedent basis.

New claims 30-39 further define the distinguishing features of the present invention over the prior art of record. Such new claims are fully supported by the original disclosure, for example, Figures 3 and 4 and, column 4, lines 25-34 of the original patent specification.

#### **Allowable Subject Matter**

Applicant appreciates the Examiner for indicating that claims 1-11 are allowed over the prior art of record.

#### **35 U.S.C. § 102(e) Rejection**

Claim 12 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Oashi et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,767,845). This rejection, insofar as it pertains to the presently pending claims, is respectfully traversed.

Regarding independent claim 12, the Examiner alleges that Oashi et al. teaches an optical disc medium comprising, *inter alia*, a second area to store a video title including audio and video data, and a third area to store additional contents associated with the video title. However, Oashi

et al. discloses a CD-ROM 201 which includes page streams as shown in Figure 5, 8 and 11 and nowhere specifically discloses that “a video title” is stored on the CD-ROM. Therefore, Oashi et al. fails to anticipate claim 12.

In the alternative, independent claim 12 also requires “said additional contents include font data for presentation in various display formats” as recited. Clearly, this feature is completely absent from Oashi et al., which is also acknowledged by the Examiner (see the Examiner’s rejection of previous claim 13).

Accordingly, this rejection is improper and should be withdrawn.

### **35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejection**

Claims 13-29 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Oashi et al. in view of Ishii et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,251,293). This rejection, insofar as it pertains to the presently pending claims, is respectfully traversed.

Since claim 13 has been added to claim 12, the Examiner’s allegations made in rejecting previous claim 13 will be now addressed in association with currently amended claim 12.

Regarding independent claim 12, the Examiner correctly acknowledges that Oashi et al. does not teach or suggest, *inter alia*, “said additional font contents include font data for presentation in various display formats”. To overcome this deficiency of Oashi et al., the Examiner then relies upon Ishii et al. and alleges that Ishii et al. discloses such a feature.

However, what Ishii et al. actually discloses is storing font data corresponding to Chinese characters in a character display apparatus. That is, in Ishii et al., Chinese character font data is embedded in the internal memory of the display device itself. Ishii et al. nowhere discloses an optical disc medium that contains font data.

Therefore, if the references were combinable, assuming *arguendo*, the combination of Oashi et al. and Ishii et al. would only produce Oashi et al.’s recording device having therein Chinese font data for display in a single display format, i.e., Chinese characters. In other words, the combination of references would clearly fail to teach or suggest, *inter alia*, an optical disc medium comprising...“a third area to store additional contents associated with the video title, wherein the additional contents data include font data for presentation in various display

formats", as recited in claim 12. Similar remarks apply to independent claims 16 and 23, which require detecting additional contents data from an optical disc and the additional contents data including font data, in a varying scope.

Accordingly, independent claims 12, 16 and 23 and their dependent claims (due to their dependency) are patentable over the applied references, and the rejection is improper and should be withdrawn.

### **CONCLUSION**

For the foregoing reasons and in view of the above clarifying amendments, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw all of the objections and rejections of record, and to provide an early issuance of a Notice of Allowance.

Should there be any outstanding matters which need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Esther H. Chong (Registration No. 40,953) at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and further replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: November 27, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By Esther Chong  
Esther H. Chong  
Registration No.: 40,953  
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP  
8110 Gatehouse Road  
Suite 100 East  
P.O. Box 747  
Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747  
(703) 205-8000  
Attorney for Applicant